

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Figs. 1-2, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 1-2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Remarks

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application, of which claims 1-25 are rejected, claims 26-34 are allowed, and claims 35-36 are withdrawn from consideration. By this paper, Applicant has amended claim 13 and canceled claims 19-22.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for not showing the second roll means, cutting means, welding arrangement and/or adhesive applying arrangement, and core ejection means. The Examiner has additionally objected to the drawings for not including reference sign 16d mentioned in the specification for spring biased push rod, and using reference number 16 to designate both punch and die arrangement and spring.

The second roll means are shown in Figure 2 as element 18. The claims referring to the cutting means, welding arrangement and/or adhesive applying arrangement, and core ejection means have been canceled (claims 19-22) rendering the Examiner's objection to the drawings moot..

Applicant has corrected Figure 2 to include element 16d, the spring biased push rod. This element was incorrectly labeled as element 16 previously. This correction also removes the duplicate element 16 from Figure 2. No new matter is presented by this amendment.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Munsterman et al. (4,403,489 or '489)

Claim 1 requires "the positioning of said punch arrangement and said mandrel is fixed." The Examiner states that Munsterman et al. '489 shows a fixed punch and mandrel, however Munsterman et al. '489 teaches that "the mandrel 42, connected to the frame 48, is also

caused to linearly move away from the punch 30..." as the material is wound. (see column 4, lines 33-36). Since the location of the punch and mandrel of Munsterman et al. '489 are not fixed, claim 1 is not anticipated by Munsterman et al. '489 .

Claims 2-9 and 23-25 are dependent claims from claim 1 and are therefore also not anticipated by Munsterman et al. '489 for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejections of claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. (4,403,489) in view of Fritzsche (4,909,057)

The Examiner has rejected claims 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. '489 in view of Fritzsche '057. Claims 10-12 depend from claim 1 and accordingly are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as stated above for claim 1.

Rejections of claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. (4,403,489) in view of Fritzsche (4,909,057) and further in view of Chubback (2,356,972)

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. '489 in view of Fritzsche '057 and further in view of Chubback '972.

Claim 13 has been amended and now requires "a second roll means interposed between said punch arrangement and a tangent point at which the material is rolled onto said mandrel". Claim 13 depends from claim 10, which is a dependent of claim 1. The Examiner states that Munsterman et al. '489 and Fritzsche '057 disclose the invention but for the second roll means, and that Chubback '972 teaches a second roll means to guide the material onto the mandrel. However, Munsterman et al. '489, Fritzsche '057, and Chubback '972 do not teach a second roll means as required in claim 13 where it must be interposed between the punch and the

tangent point. Additionally, the roll means 44 in Chubback '972 (Examiner cites 41, which are support rods and believed by the Applicant to have been cited by mistake) serves the same function as the build roller 20 in the present application, which is at the tangent point. No other roll means are shown by Chubback '972. Therefore, claim 13 as amended is believed to be nonobvious over the combination of Munsterman et al. '489, Fritzsche '057, and Chubback '972.

Claims 14-18 depend from claim 13 and are nonobvious for at least the reasons stated above with respect to claim 13.

Rejections of claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. (4,403,489), Fritzsche (4,909,057), and Chubback (2,356,972), and further in view of Hart (3,283,399)

The Examiner has rejected claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. '489, Fritzsche '057, Chubback '972 and further in view of Hart '399. Claims 19-20 are canceled by this paper.

Rejections of claims 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. (4,403,489) in view of Hart (3,283,399)

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munsterman et al. '489 in view of Hart '399. Claims 21-22 are canceled by this paper.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 26-34 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully asserts that the application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is hereby respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean James Patterson et al

By /John E. Nemazi/

John E. Nemazi
Reg. No. 30,876
Attorney for Applicant

Date: March 9, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351